

REMARKS

Claims 37-69 were pending in the application and were rejected. Claims 37-69 are canceled, and Claims 70-129 are added.

Claim 49 was objected to because of a typographical error. Claim 49 is canceled.

Fig. 2 was objected to because of a typographical error. The error is corrected in the PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO DRAWINGS filed herewith.

Claims 42, 43, 60, 61 were rejected under 35 USC 112. These claims are canceled.

Claims 37-69 were each rejected under 35 USC 102 over one or more of the following references: Newman (U.S. patent no. 5,835,907), Dussell et al. (U.S. patent no. 5,938,721), Girerd et al. (U.S. patent no. 6,131,067), and Berstis (U.S. patent no. 6,182,010). The new claims are believed to be allowable over these references for the following reasons.

Claim 70 is directed to processing "traffic information that indicates traffic conditions relevant to a position" of a mobile unit. Claim 70 is supported by the original disclosure – note Applicants' specification, page 3, lines 30-31.

Some embodiments of Claim 70 can be used to manage a fleet of trucks or other vehicles (note specification, page 1, lines 23-24). A truck can be equipped with a GPS capable mobile system. The mobile system automatically determines the traffic conditions relevant to the truck's position (e.g. using the truck's average speed as an indicator of how heavy the traffic is). The mobile systems transmit the position and the traffic conditions to a company computer. Suppose a first truck's mobile system (the "first mobile system" of Claim 70) transmits such information to the company computer ("the first system"). The company computer determines that the first truck is traveling at a location L, and the traffic conditions are heavy. The computer then alerts a second truck's mobile system ("second mobile system") to re-route the second truck around the location L and/or change the second truck's delivery schedule (the schedule of freight delivery by the second truck).

Alternatively, the first mobile system of Claim 70 may correspond to the first truck's system determining and transmitting the truck's position and the traffic information to the

company computer, and the second mobile system may correspond to the same truck's receiver that receives information from the company computer. The company computer may re-route the first truck and/or change the first truck's delivery schedule.

These examples are given for illustration and not to limit Claim 70. In particular, Claim 70 is not limited to trucks, GPS, company computers, or the delivery business.

Turning to the four cited references, Newman's device transmits GPS coordinates and an emergency indicator (Fig. 2, step 214). Newman does not teach or suggest transmission of information indicating traffic conditions as recited in Claim 70.

Dussell et al. and Girerd et al. are no more pertinent.

Berstis describes a vehicle navigation system that provides visual information to the driver when the driver approaches an intersection (col. 1, lines 63-65; col. 2, lines 22-23). The visual information is "a still photograph of the intersection" or a "moving video" (col. 2, lines 29-32; col. 7, lines 23-24). The visual information is collected in advance by other vehicles (e.g. police cars), and is stored in a server (col. 2, lines 44-48). The driver receives the visual information from the server via a wireless connection (col. 2, lines 49-51).

Berstis does not teach or suggest that the police cars or other vehicles transmit the visual information to the server "over a network" as recited in Claim 70. Note Berstis' col. 6, line 42, through col. 7, line 22, describing the visual information acquisition and storage at the server. Claim 70 is directed to at least two mobile units communicating over a network. Berstis does not teach this invention.

Claims 71-73 depend from Claim 70.

Claim 74 is believed to be allowable for reasons similar to the reasons given above for Claim 70.

Claims 75-77 depend from Claim 74.

Claim 78 is directed to processing "location-relevant information which indicates operating conditions of a vehicle and which is relevant to the vehicle's position". Claim 78 is supported by the original disclosure, as noted in Applicants' specification, page 9, lines 14-15.

Some embodiments of Claim 78 can be used to schedule vehicle operation and repairs. A vehicle can be equipped with a GPS capable mobile system that can determine the position of the vehicle and also determine the operating conditions (e.g. brake conditions, engine temperature, etc.) The mobile system can transmit this information to a company computer. Such transmissions are known. See e.g. U.S. patent no. 6,006,159 issued to Schmier et al., col., 3, lines 44-59.

Claim 78 distinguishes from Schmier et al. and the other four references (Newman, Dussell, Girerd and Berstis) by reciting "a network transmission to a second mobile unit, wherein the network transmission to the second mobile unit is performed based on the location-relevant information received from the first mobile unit".

For example, the second mobile unit may be another mobile unit on the same vehicle, to alert the driver that the vehicle schedule must be changed to accommodate repairs. Alternatively, the second mobile unit may be a mobile repair service that must meet the vehicle to perform the repairs. Of importance, Claim 78 recites that the network transmission to the second mobile unit is "based on the *location-relevant* information", i.e. the information relevant to the vehicle's position. For example, the vehicle repair schedule may be determined based on the vehicle's position, e.g. using a repair shop close to the vehicle, and not merely a predefined repair shop.

These examples are given for illustration and not to limit Claim 78.

Schmier et al. do not teach or suggest transmission to a second mobile unit based on information relevant to the vehicle's position as recited in Claim 78.

Newman, Dussell et al., Girerd et al. and Berstis do not teach transmitting information indicating the vehicle's operating conditions as recited in Claim 78.

Claims 79-82 depend from Claim 78.

Claim 83 is believed to be allowable for reasons similar to the reasons given above for Claim 78.

Claims 84-87 depend from Claim 83.

Claim 88 is directed to processing "location-relevant information which indicates maintenance conditions of a vehicle and which is relevant to the vehicle's position". In one example, the maintenance conditions include the vehicle's odometer reading or other information indicating that a maintenance on the vehicle must be performed.

Claim 88 is believed to be allowable for reasons similar to the reasons given above for Claim 78.

Claims 89-92 depend from Claim 88.

Claim 93 is believed to be allowable for reasons similar to the reasons given above for Claim 88.

Claims 94-97 depend from Claim 93.

Claim 98 is directed to user authentication. A typical authentication procedure requires the user to enter a password, as described in Applicants' specification, page 7, last line. Claim 98 is directed to a different authentication method – the user is authenticated if the user correctly indicates the position of a "first mobile system". For example, suppose a user (a person named A) wants to enter into an on-line transaction (e.g. a sales transaction) with person B. The user A is driving a vehicle equipped with a GPS capable system. The vehicle is accessible to an authenticating system that performs an authentication service for B.

In order to verify that the user is indeed A, the authenticating system requires the user to enter the position of A's vehicle. The authenticating system also independently obtains the A's vehicle's position from the vehicle's GPS capable system. If the position obtained from the vehicle's system matches the position entered by the user, the user is assumed to be A (the authentication succeeds). If not, the authentication fails.

This example illustrates but does not limit Claim 98. In particular, Claim 98 is not limited to GPS, the first mobile system does not have to be installed on a vehicle (it may be installed on a horse, for example), the transaction does not have to be a sales transaction, the authentication operation can be part of a larger authentication procedure (for example, the user may also be required to enter a password), and so on. The user does not have to be a human being, but can be an automated system.

The five references discussed above do not relate to authentication.

Claims 99-105 depend from Claim 98.

Claims 106-129 are believed to be allowable for reasons similar to the reasons given above for Claim 98.

Any questions regarding this case can be addressed to the undersigned at the telephone number below.

EXPRESS MAIL LABEL NO:
EV 174800301 US

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Shenker

Michael Shenker
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 34,250
Telephone: (408) 392-9250